UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,443	06/28/2005	Georg Michelson	F-8245	7351
	7590 03/18/201 HAMBURG LLP	EXAMINER		
122 EAST 42ND STREET SUITE 4000 NEW YORK, NY 10168			SHAHRESTANI, NASIR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comment	10/509,443	MICHELSON, GEORG				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	NASIR SHAHRESTANI	3737				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 No</u>	ovember 2009					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pane Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 455 C.G. 215.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 21-25</u> is/are pending in the a	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 21-25</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 21-25</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the control of the contro	of the certified copies not receive 4)	(PTO-413) te				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-18, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishida et al. (U.S. 7,055,955 B2) in view of Monchalin et al. (U.S. 6,078,397) and further in view of Hatschek (U.S. 5,309,916).

Kishida et al. teach a laser Doppler eyed fundus blood flowmeter wherein blood flow parameters are obtained and the vessel diameter of the measured blood vessel is obtained so as to measure the blood flow rate in the blood vessel (col. 1 lines 17-29).

Kishida et al. do not teach the relation between the measurement of flow velocity and internal vessel diameter determination with that of a vessel wall thickness.

Monchalin et al. teach a method and apparatus for mapping the wall thickness of tubes (see title) wherein the invention is based on using a single laser Doppler system to measure the wall thickness (see fig. 7). The calculation is done by comparing the internal diameter of the tubular structure with that of the outer diameter of the tubular structure (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Kishida et al. wherein a laser-Doppler device is utilized to determine vessel parameters of the retina and to have included the means for determining wall thickness as outlined by Monchalin et al. in order to provided for more diagnostic parameters of the retinal vascular structures.

Kishida et al. in view of Monchalin et al. do not specifically teach the measurement and calculation of the inner diameter of the blood vessel in order to provide data for the calculation of the thickness of a blood vessel.

Hatschek teaches a blood pressure measuring device comprising a sensor arrangement which is releasable attached to the exterior of a body and which is electrically conductively connected with electronic circuit. Hatschek provides a teaching calculating the elasticity of the blood vessel wall. Two parameters are provided; thickness of the blood vessel wall and interior diameter of said blood vessel (col. 3 lines 40-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Kishida et al. in view of Monchalin et al. and to have integrated the teachings of Hatschek and to have provided parameters with regards to inner diameter of a blood vessel in order to provide a difference of inner and outer diameters of a blood vessel, leading to the calculation of the blood vessel.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3737

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NASIR SHAHRESTANI whose telephone number is (571)270-1031. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs: 7:30-5:00, 2nd Friday: 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/509,443

Art Unit: 3737

/BRIAN CASLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737

Page 5

/Nasir Shahrestani/ Examiner, Art Unit 3737